

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action dated February 15, 2006. Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1-7, 9-19, 21-27, 29, and 30 are rejected, and Claims 8, 20, and 28 are objected to. For the reasons provided below, Applicant submits that the pending claims are allowable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

#### Section 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1, 4-5, 9-10, 12-13, 16-17, 21, 23-26 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,601,175 ("*Arnold*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,718,468 ("*Challener*") and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,067,625 ("*Ryu*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and the assertions and holdings therein.

Independent claim 1 recites, "generating a password in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event." For the teaching of this limitation, the Examiner offers the limited used administrative password disclosed in *Arnold*. Applicants submit that the Office Action fails to consider each and every word of claim 1. "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." M.P.E.P. § 2143.03 (citing *In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970)). In judging the patentability of claim 1, the Office Action fails to consider at least the phrase "in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event." In contrast, *Arnold* merely discloses generating a password "on an as-needed basis." *Arnold*, Col. 7, Lines 10-15. In other words, the offered password is generated on request, *not* in response to an occurrence of a prescribed password generation event.

In addition, the Examiner has not shown a suggestion or motivation in the references or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the cited references. In fact, Applicants submit that *Challener* teaches away from combining the

encrypted package disclosed in *Challener* with the password recovery system disclosed in *Ryu*. The Examiner merely speculates that "one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated ... so as to obtain the needed password for accessing the information." However, there is no motivation to combine *Ryu*'s password recovery system because *Challener* does not teach, suggest, or disclose the use of a decodable password such that a remote service center may decrypt the encrypted packaged. *Challener*, in contrast, teaches encrypting a first password and a random password into an encrypted package. The encrypted package is then stored locally on the hard disk. Col. 4, Lines 37-41. Applicant was unable to locate any passage in *Challener* that teaches or suggests that the encrypted package is displayed to a user, much less that the user can receive either the first password or random password by providing the encrypted package to a remote password provider. In fact, *Challener* teaches that the encrypted package may only be decrypted with the use of a locally stored public key, the signature chip, and a user's pass phrase. Col. 4, Lines 30-49. Therefore, *Challener* teaches away from an encrypted package that may be decrypted by a remote password provider as disclosed in *Ryu*. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 13 and 24 recite limitations that are similar, although not identical, to the limitation of Claim 1 discussed above. Therefore, these claims are allowable for reasons analogous to those discussed above in connection with claim 1. Claims 17, 23, and 26 each depend from one of independent claims 13 and 24 and are thus also patentable over the cited art.

The Office Action rejects claims 2-3 and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of *Challener* in view of *Ryu* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,382 ("*Thompson*"). Also, the Office Action rejects claims 6, 18, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of *Challener* in view of *Ryu* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0139349 ("*Henn*"). Further, the Office Action rejects claims 7 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of *Challener* in view of *Ryu* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0031030 ("*Kidder*"). In addition, the Office Action rejects claims 11, 22, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Arnold* in view of *Challener* in view of *Ryu* and

further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,270,943 ("*Warn*"). Applicant traverses these rejections and all findings and assertions therein. In particular, these depend from one of independent claims 1, 13, and 24. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 13, and 24 are allowable over the combination of *Arnold*, *Challener*, and *Ryu*. The Office Action fails to cite any teaching or suggestion in *Thompson*, *Henn*, *Kidder* and *Warn* of the missing elements discussed above. Therefore, claims 2-3, 6, 7, 11, 14-15, 18, 19, 22, 27, and 30 are allowable at least because they depend from one of allowable claims 1, 13, and 24. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn.

**Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant notes and appreciates the Examiner's indication that claims 8, 20, and 28 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, claims 8, 20, and 28 depend from one of Independent claims 1, 13, and 24, which Applicant respectfully submits are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant has not amended claims 8, 20, and 28 at this time.

Applicant : Craig Lewis  
Serial No. : 09/922,178  
Filed : August 2, 2001  
Page : 13 of 13

Attorney's Docket No.: 15828-160001 / PE-00-035

### CONCLUSION

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all Claims.


If the present application is not allowed and/or if one or more of the rejections is maintained, Applicant hereby requests a telephone conference with the Examiner and further requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to schedule the telephone conference.

Enclosed is a Petition for a One-Month Extension of Time and a check in the amount of \$120 for the extension filing fee. No other fees are believed to be due at this time. However, please apply any deficiencies or any other required fees or any credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing the attorney docket number shown above.

Respectfully submitted,

Date:

June 15, 2006



Michael E. Cox  
Reg. No. 47,505

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 760-6107  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091